

APPLICANT ARGUMENTS OR REMARKS MADE IN AN AMENDMENT

Claims Pending

Claims 1-15 were pending. Claims 9, 11 and 13-15 have been cancelled by amendment herein. Thus, claims 1-8, 10 and 12 are now pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC 112

- i) The phrase “or a prodrug” has been removed from claims 1, 6 and 7, thus overcoming the rejection of these claims on the basis of the inclusion of this phrase. The rejection of claim 15 on this basis is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 15.
- ii) The rejection of claim 9 is rendered moot by its cancellation.
- iii) In claim 10, the typographical error “HIV 11” has been corrected to read “HIV-1”.
- iv) The rejections of claims 13 and 14 are rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.
- v) The rejection of claim 11 is rendered moot by its cancellation.
- vi) The rejections of claims 6-9 and 15 due to the inclusion of the phrase “or the prevention” are overcome by the deletion of this phrase from the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogilvie et al. (US 2003-0069226 A1). The rejection of the claims on this basis is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The present claims are directed to compounds wherein the moiety Q is either a lactam (cyclic amide) or a cyclic carbamate (ring which includes the group –NH(CO)O-). The compounds described by the Ogilvie reference differ from those now claimed in that the moiety W (which corresponds to Q) is in all instances a sultam (a cyclic sulfonamide). There is nothing in the Ogilvie reference that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the sultam moiety W with a lactam or carbamate, to yield the compounds of the present invention. It is respectfully asserted that a *prima facie* case of structural obviousness has not been established.

Miscellaneous Claim Amendments

Claim 2 has been amended. It should be noted that prior to amendment, claim 2 actually consisted of 3 sentences, rather than one as required. The claim has been amended so that it is now a single sentence. The second and third sentences set forth preferred definitions for R¹⁴ and R¹⁸. These have been removed. The second sentence also set forth additional definitions for Q. These have been retained.

Application No. 10/662,856
Amendment dated May 8, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 21, 2005

Summary

It is respectfully asserted that the amendments made herein overcome all bases for rejection of the claims and place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan Stempel/
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 28,991

Patent Department
Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.
900 Ridgebury Road
P.O. Box 368
Ridgefield, CT. 06877
Tel.: (203) 798-4868